

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

6017

Some have posed the question, in response to my reasoning and statements, "What kind of a nut is he?" The answer is best given by my hometown daily, the Odessa American, as follows:

WHAT KIND OF A "NUT" IS HE?

He wants to run his own business.
He wants to select his own doctor.
He wants to make his own bargains.
He wants to buy his own insurance.
He wants to select his own reading matter.
He wants to provide for his own old age.
He wants to make his own contracts.
He wants to select his own charities.
He wants to educate his children as he wishes.
He wants to make his own investments.
He wants to select his own friends.
He wants to provide his own recreation.
He wants to compete freely in the marketplace.
He wants to grow by his own efforts.
He wants to profit from his own errors.
He wants to take part in the competition of ideas.

He wants to be a man of good will.
What kind of a nut is he? He's an American who understands and believes in the Declaration of Independence, that's what kind.

Aren't you glad you are too? And don't you wonder why so many of our fellow-Americans are trying so hard to destroy the kind of life that has made us the aim and the envy of every other people on earth?

The questions is: What kind of nuts are they?

NUCLEAR SUBMARINE—THE "THRESHER"

(Mr. BECKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach this Easter season, this being Holy Thursday, tomorrow Good Friday, and on Sunday our Lord rises from the dead and is resurrected, I am impelled to say a word about the 129 young Americans whose bodies probably are entombed at the bottom of the North Atlantic in our great attack submarine, the *Thresher*.

I am sure every Member of this House feels just as I do that it is a great tragedy and that if one of our sons were there, it would be a terrible personal tragedy.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members of this House with a tremendous responsibility in passing the Selective Service Act and drafting or otherwise inducing our young men into the service of the United States for the protection and freedom of our citizens, my prayers, and I am sure those of my colleagues, today and over this weekend go out for sympathy to the parents and the members of the families of these young men.

Our first prayers express hope that they may be rescued and returned; yet, at this time I have the feeling and it has been voiced in official circles that there is little hope left for them.

So my prayers, our prayers, go out to the families of these young men. Surely, it is some consolation to them that these men died in the service of their country. It is our duty to see that their deaths shall not have been in vain and that this House of Representatives now and

in the future will see to it that we try to preserve that peace for which they gave their lives.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1962—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 27)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10(b)4 of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 11, 1963.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight Saturday, April 13, to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HEED WARNINGS ABOUT REDS IN THE CARIBBEAN

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record in three instances.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the April 6, 1963, issue of the Miami Herald, and in the April 9, 1963, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times, editorials appeared concerning my efforts to warn the Congress and the American people of the Communist conspiracy pushing toward impending disaster in certain areas in the Western Hemisphere. Although the editorials, for which I am deeply grateful, speak for themselves, I would like to remind this great body that the Herald is the largest daily newspaper in the State of Florida and the largest American daily sitting closest to Cuba and to the Caribbean while the Chicago Sun-Times expresses a similar view many miles to the north. I hold a great deal of respect for their evaluation of the present situation in the Caribbean and am, therefore, inserting their editorials in the Record at this point. I believe the Herald's and Sun-Times' evaluation of my statements to be a further substantiation of the facts and for my concern. I have asked the British Government to advise me of the number of Russians, Red Chinese, and satellite nations' passports they have issued in the last 2 years. The British have an open door to the Caribbean for

the Communists—still do business with those countries—including Castro's Cuba. The United States has made no public request to Great Britain to end this aid to the Communist. Is not it about time such a demand was made?

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Apr. 6, 1963]

RED DOMINOES FROM CUBA?

The possibility of a "domino effect" in the West Indies has existed since Cuba fell to the Reds 4 years ago. Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, cites disturbing signs of stepped-up Soviet activity to topple the chain of islands which form the eastern shore of the Caribbean, the Mediterranean of the New World.

Mr. CRAMER predicts flatly that Haiti will fall within 3 or 4 months unless the United States takes emergency action. This won't be news to Herald readers who have followed on-the-scene reports of impending disaster in Haiti, which shares the island of Hispaniola with the Dominican Republic.

All that separates Haiti from Communist Cuba is the deep and narrow Windward Passage, a major world sealane. The two countries are literally within sight of each other, and many Haitians work in Cuban sugarfields.

Mr. CRAMER attributes his information to "sources which I consider completely reliable." They tell him there are Russians—"as many as 1 Russian to every 10 natives"—in major cities of such key islands as Trinidad, Barbados, and Curacao.

The reliability of Mr. CRAMER's sources may be appraised by his recent reports of travel to Cuba from Mexico. He got his facts from the manifests of Cubana Airlines planes. They showed 3,447 trips to Cuba by this route in a 6-month period last year. Nearly half the travelers were from 17 Latin American countries. There were 265 from Russia and its satellites. Ninety-nine citizens of the United States made the journey in defiance of a U.S. ban.

No one has challenged the accuracy of Mr. CRAMER's figures on the comings and goings between Mexico City and Cuba. No one in official position has done anything about it, either.

If his reports on Russian infiltration of the West Indies are correct, the danger to the Americas is obvious. The islands command all the eastern approaches to the Panama Canal. They are the "soft underbelly" of the Western Hemisphere, like Europe's relation to islands in the Mediterranean and the north coast of Africa.

The Congressman from St. Petersburg is serving as a present-day Paul Revere. What counts will be the response to his warnings.

We need help.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Apr. 9, 1963]

ANOTHER CARIBBEAN THREAT

The Windward and Leeward Islands stretch like a curved necklace of green jewels from south of Puerto Rico almost to the coast of Venezuela. The islands, rich in history, separate the Atlantic Ocean from the Caribbean Sea. First discovered by Columbus the islands for long years were a first port of call for European ships, riding the trade winds down the long reaches of the Atlantic.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, has charged that many of the Windward and Leeward Islands are heavily infiltrated with Russians. He says that in many of the towns in the island chain the ratio of Russians to natives is 1 to 10.

If this is true, and Representative CRAMER says his information is completely reliable, then Great Britain now has reason to be an active partner in the U.S. efforts to rid the Caribbean of the Russian influence.

The islands are under the protection of Great Britain.

It is easy to see why Russia would make a great effort to influence this island chain. The Windward and Leeward Islands stand squarely athwart the ocean highway leading to the Panama Canal. In a strategic sense they dominate the entire northern and eastern coast of South America and they afford many deepwater harbors suitable for naval bases.

Representative CRAMER also says that Russia is training Haitian sugar field workers in Cuba in the arts of sabotage and subversion. He declares that Russian arms caches in Haiti and the Dominican Republic are extensive and ominous.

Haiti is an even more sensitive area than the Windward and Leeward Island chain, so far as the safety and defense of the United States is concerned. If Haiti, a miserably poor and backward country ruled by an ironfisted dictator steeped in voodoo mysticism should fall into the Red orbit then the most important sea passage in the Caribbean, the Windward Passage, would be flanked on the one side by Cuba and on the other by Haiti. The free world cannot afford the loss of this strategic seaway; the United States cannot tolerate such a loss.

Haiti has long been ripe for a political change of an abrupt and bloody nature. The country seethes with rumors of conspiracies by one or more of a score of clandestine organizations that range from the pro-Castro and anti-Castro Communists to Roman Catholic action groups.

The United States has emphasized its disapproval of Haiti's president, Francois "Papa Doc" Duvalier, by cutting off almost all of the U.S. economic assistance program to Haiti. This action has enraged even the pro-U.S. factions in Haiti.

The eventual fate of Haiti is not yet clear but the threat posed by Russian infiltration of the Windward and Leeward Islands, as outlined by Representative CRAMER, is very clear. Great Britain has seen fit to cooperate with the United States in deterring Cuban patriots from making punitive attacks on Russian shipping; now Great Britain should clear the Russians out of Britain's island protectorates. The United States and the Organization of American States should offer all possible assistance.

VACILLATING CUBAN POLICY CONCERNS MANY MEMBERS OF THE PRESS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD, an editorial which appeared in the Fort Lauderdale News, Fort Lauderdale, Fla. I am also inserting two articles, one written by Columnist Henry J. Taylor and the other through the services of the North American Newspaper Alliance.

Although written by different men from throughout the world, all have one thing in common—concern over this country's vacillating, timorous, and highly questionable policy with regards to Cuba. I think their messages are of primary concern to all Americans and I recommend them to the attention of my colleagues for their careful study and consideration.

For many years now, I have been advocating a firmer U.S. policy toward Castro and the Communist threat in this hemisphere. A careful analysis of these articles most assuredly justifies my growing concern and raises many interesting questions which I feel the administration has a duty to answer:

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Mar. 29, 1963]

PRICE ON CUBAN POLICY MAY RUN EVEN HIGHER THAN WE BARGAINED FOR

Despite the Kennedy administration's obvious success in getting some of the top Republican leaders to soft-pedal the Cuban issue, this entire situation continues to be a highly irritating bone in the throats of the American people as a whole.

Why this is so isn't difficult to see. The Communist-controlled Government and the Soviet troops in Cuba are an accomplished fact and no amount of administration doubletalk can hide this situation.

This, in turn, leads to only one conclusion. Again, despite doubletalk from the White House and the State Department, this Nation's long-standing Monroe Doctrine has definitely been sidetracked as our official policy now amounts to nothing more than a "containment" of the Communist regime in Cuba rather than a positive program of removal or ejection.

Now, there may be reasons why this administration is fearful of removing the Communist plague in Cuba. We have been told that one of the basic reasons happens to be that we don't want to force Russia into a position where the Soviets will have to resort to war to save face. We have also been told that Cuba cannot be separated from other trouble spots throughout the world and that any action on our part to oust the Soviets from Cuba is quite apt to trigger repercussions in Berlin and elsewhere that could easily bring on a devastating war.

So, to avoid these things we have adopted the policy of trying to solve the Cuban problem with words rather than with deeds. Our Government tells us no concessions have been given to the Russians in return for the removal of Soviet missiles and Soviet long-range bombers from Cuba. Yet everything that has happened since the missiles were supposedly removed indicates that concessions or pledges were made on our part.

One of these concessions may or may not have been a pledge by us to discourage or prevent attacks by rebel forces on Cuba. Russia, in bitterly protesting an armed attack against a Soviet ship a couple of weeks ago, charges that this represents a violation of the Kennedy-Khrushchev agreement and that if the attacks are continued the result may well be to heat up the crisis again.

Hardly had this protest been received in Washington than another and reportedly more serious attack on a Soviet vessel took place. This brought immediate orders from Washington for a full-scale investigation by the Coast Guard, FBI, and other agencies to determine if these attacks were being launched from U.S. soil.

Already Washington has decried these rebel attacks as being "irresponsible" and dangerous. Dangerous they might well be. But if it is "irresponsible" for courageous Cubans to use every method they can devise to strike back at invaders who have taken over their homeland, then a lot of people in this country and in Cuba have to learn a new definition of this word.

From all these events it is clearly evident to any sensible person that rather than winning a victory in forcing the Russians to take their missiles from Cuba we have suffered a rather inglorious defeat. It may be true we avoided a serious threat of war by calling off our blockade and pulling back our forces when we unquestionably had the upper hand.

But, if the price is now to be acceptance of a full-blown Russian military base in our own backyard, then we, and a great many other Americans, gravely question the thinking behind this policy.

It will be recalled that for a while Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, of Great Britain, was acclaimed as a great hero for preserving "peace in our time" by virtue of

the concessions he gave Adolf Hitler. Yet, history has shown that these concessions added up in the long run to one of the sorriest mistakes ever made by any world leader. They didn't avert war, they only made it more inevitable, and the same may well be true of the appeasement policy we are now following in regard to Cuba.

No nation can avoid a war by displaying weakness or fear. Yet, weakness and fear are the hallmarks of our Cuban policy today. This our people realize, and this is why they simply cannot understand nor accept the indecisive and spineless attitude our Government is taking today.

President Kennedy and his advisers don't have to look very hard or very far to understand why his popularity, as evidenced by the Gallup Poll, is dropping off at an increasing pace. The hard truth happens to be that more and more of our people each day are becoming sick and disgusted with our timorous and vacillating policy on Cuba.

It is an issue that cannot be tucked quietly under the rug by inducing congressional opponents to stay quiet on the subject. It is the big, burning issue of the day, and until there is less talk and more action out of Washington to meet it forthrightly and courageously, it is not going to be shoved aside or forgotten.

OUR CUBAN POLICY'S A LEAKY BEANBAG

(By Henry J. Taylor)

British General Ritchie, later relieved by Montgomery, was defeated by Marshal Rommel in the desert battle at Knightsbridge, leading to the fateful fall of Tobruk.

Ritchie's headquarters were camouflaged in great disarray behind a mesa in the Libyan sands. I traveled there to see him with doughty U.S. General Scott. Ritchie, crouching over the maps, showed Scott his field position. "What should I do?" he asked.

"Well, General," Scott replied, "I don't know what you should do. But I know this. You're going to have to do something different from what you're doing now, because you're getting the hell beat out of you."

So it is with our policy toward Castro, built along the lines of a leaky beanbag.

Who would have dreamed that mighty America could have come full circle? In one's wildest imagination could anyone conceive a foreign policy that could arrive at such a dismal, defunct, and dangerous end?

Here we said, as the minimum demand of the American people, that "a Communist state will not be tolerated in the Western Hemisphere," that "communism is not negotiable in the Western Hemisphere," that the Castro cancer would defeat our security throughout Latin America and even pledging to the ransomed freedom fighters that their bloodied pennant will be returned to them in a freed Cuba, and what happens? We end up protecting, guaranteeing, and solidifying Red Castro and the Soviet lodgment there with all the power of our great Air Force and the U.S. Navy.

If we have a foreign policy, or, rather, if what we have can be called a policy, you might as well call Humpty Dumpty the Rock of Gibraltar.

This is not a policy; it is a debacle in thinking. The results are cumulative, like cancer is cumulative, finally spreading beyond correction. And who can deny the frightful cost of historic errors which quickly become impossible of correction?

That's the really lethal damage in our wrongheaded thinkers' manipulation of the news. By employing an acute sense of timing, and such distractions as the President's appearance before the ransomed freedom fighters in Miami, the grim failures can be—and are—compounded one after the other along a retreat road never made clear to the American people.

With each one, as in the case of the Bay of Pigs and then our October 22 Munich, the choice of corrections narrows. It becomes limited to a choice of bad choices among worse choices.

Thus, mile by sandy mile, President Kennedy has negotiated our position downhill. Step by step, as the resulting situation has closed in (which is the purpose of the enemy), our Government is forced into the inevitable alibi: that to do something different from what it next proposes would be worse than what it now must do. Then that bad choice is called wisdom. Accordingly, we end up what we're doing now. Knightsbridge to Tobruk to where?

A Humpty-Dumpty policy is not good enough for the world's leading power nor will it allow us to remain that. There are always barbarians outside the walls. No leading nation, no matter how productive or apparently powerful, can live through our incredible behavior in a decisive area like Cuba without correction. Either we correct our fantastic blunders, as Montgomery corrected Ritchie's, somehow, somehow, or Rommel in the form of the U.S.S.R. will correct them for us.

Politicians skin our ears with baroque oratory, cliché piled on cliché, announcing that the United States must meet its world responsibilities. Yet the first responsibility of a government is to supply security to its own citizens by correcting its own failures.

We talk of healing the world when we are not securely governing ourselves. We're glants when pronouncing of the universe and pigmies in our own performance.

In tragic truth, Castro's Russian masters have outthought us, outmaneuvered us, and cast us out of control of the situation besides. How else—how else—could we now find ourselves forced to order a wrong-way blockade against fighters for freedom instead of against Castro?

UNITED STATES, RUSSIA MADE DEAL, FRENCH SAY

PARIS.—The idea Russia and the United States have made a secret bargain involving the withdrawal of American missiles from Europe in exchange for the Soviets pulling their missiles out of Cuba is now official French doctrine.

This was revealed by an article in the "Revue Militaire d'Information" regarded as the most authoritative publication put out under the imprint of the French Defense Ministry.

The two great powers bypassed their allies, the magazine asserted, and came to an arrangement between themselves. This was the meaning of the disclosure so soon after the Cuban crisis that Jupiter missile installations in Turkey and Italy would be dismantled, it added.

The magazine went on: "There was thus indeed an agreement between the great powers on the 'demissilization' of Western Europe, an operation evidently demanded by the Soviets in return for their own nuclear disengagement in Cuba. This is a strange alliance in which the most exposed allies are deprived of a part of the means of assuring their security through an accord reached over their heads and with the principal opponent."

The article's anonymous author declared the whole idea of a NATO multinational nuclear force—which France has spurned—was cooked up afterwards as a maneuver to disguise the truth.

"Western public opinion was tricked," he declared. There was "clearly nothing" to America's insistence that a multinational force based on seagoing Polaris missiles was a decisive step forward in modernizing Western Europe's defenses.

Allied diplomatic sources here were startled by the vehemence and bitterness of the

article, appearing as it did in an official publication. They agreed it could not have been published without President de Gaulle's approval and confirms that he regards present American nuclear policy as, firstly, a step toward total subjugation of Western Europe to American strategy, and, secondarily, a Soviet-American settlement prejudicial to the interests of America's allies whose views, in the final analysis, Washington will simply ignore.

The article dismissed the Nassau agreement between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan as nothing more than a move to insure Britain also would be dependent on American strategy and her nuclear independence limited.

The article makes clear that De Gaulle regards the multinational nuclear force proposal as more of a political move designed to give Washington absolute control of Allied destinies than fulfilling a genuine strategic need.

The French military writer declared that whatever the vulnerability of the Jupiter missiles on the ground, they compelled a potential aggressor to use nuclear weapons first in order to destroy them before mounting his main attack.

But, he added, removal of missiles from the soil of Western Europe meant the decision on whether nuclear weapons were to be used to check an attack on the Continent had switched from the aggressor to Washington.

He declared "under the pretext of modernizing the armaments of Turkey and Italy, the United States has cleverly disengaged itself by absolutely reserving for itself the privilege of an eventual intervention."

SHAME!

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the precipitous action of this administration in confining anti-Castro Cubans to the Miami area and halting their symbolic raids on Cuba, their supplying men and arms and food to the underground, will, I think, be regarded by future historians as the true turning point in America's long and distinguished fight for individual freedom and human dignity.

For never before, in the history of our great country, have we purposefully and deliberately hampered the efforts of men who are willing to fight for what all men have traditionally wanted—and died for—their homeland's freed.

The administration's effort to stop these brave Cubans from exercising their will violates the sacredness of all that we, as Americans, hold so dear: liberty and freedom.

I believe it will be discovered, as Americans awake to what has actually transpired, that this administration has misjudged completely the temperament of the people.

At this point, I would like to insert in the Record an editorial which appeared in the April 3, 1963, issue of the Richmond News-Leader, entitled "Shame!"

SHAME!

The most melancholy manifestation of the administration's "no win" policy is to be seen in the maddening restrictions newly clamped upon the anti-Castro raiders. In heaven's name, who are we fighting—our friends, or our enemies? What new heights of hypocrisy and timidity is Mr. Kennedy reaching for now?

In cracking down on these heroic men, our Government has announced that the United States does not propose "to see our own

laws violated with impunity, or to tolerate activities which might provoke armed reprisals."

It makes you a little sick at the stomach. At the time of the Bay of Pigs fiasco, our own Government violated every neutrality act on the statute books, and a dozen other laws besides. As recently as last October when the President's spine was stiffer, our own Government engaged in activities that might well have provoked full-scale armed reprisal. To this day, we are engaged in Vietnam in a military action filled with risk of a broadened war.

What is to be gained by hobbling the raiders? It is said that their continued hit-and-run attacks will provide a justification to the Russians for keeping troops in Cuba. This is the only line of reasoning that makes any sense, and it doesn't make much sense. If the Russians want to keep their troops in Cuba, they can trump up a justification on their own. And when did the Russians justify their course of conduct anyhow?

A second argument is that these sporadic raids will provoke attacks on American shipping in the Caribbean. All right. Suppose they do. The U.S. Navy is not helpless to protect ships flying the American flag. There is a French proverb to the effect that you can't make an omelet without breaking some eggs. We ought not to imagine that effective pressure can be kept on Castro without risking some loss of life and property.

Against these pusillanimous and legalistic arguments, every consideration of patriotism and every factor of morale have been discounted. It is said that the raiders accomplish nothing significant: They sink a freighter, they blow up a dock, they drop leaflets, they land a few rifles. These achievements are counted as nothing at all.

We count such activities for a very great deal. "Exiles feed on hope," says Creon in "Antigone." These brave conspiracies, these heady raids along the Cuban coast, are visible symbols of the fire of counterrevolution. They are feats of derring-do from which legends are made. To thousands of Cubans longing for freedom from Castro's Communist rule, the raiders bring a message that sustains: Have courage. You are not forgotten.

Mr. Kennedy would snuff out this spark of resistance; he would jam the message. He will not countenance a Cuban Government in exile; he will not tolerate attacks on Castro's Cuba. The British are brought into this disgraceful affair, in order to round up a band of 17 raiders in the Bahamas; the presumption is strong that our own Central Intelligence Agency exposed their hideout. Henceforth the Cuban commandoes must fight two foes—the Communist enemy in front, the American "friend" behind.

Bravery. Personal heroism. A certain impudence. A sense of glory. These are qualities once highly esteemed in the American tradition. Why must they now be suffocated in a fog of diplomacy and a blanket of neutrality law? Shame, Mr. Kennedy. We cry shame.

LAO SITUATION EXAMPLE OF DESTINY MANAGEMENT

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, last July when the Declaration and Protocol on Neutrality in Laos was signed, I sent a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk in which I raised very serious questions about the wisdom of entering into an agreement under the terms contained in

April 11

that document. The doubts I expressed in that letter and in the subsequent exchange of letters seem to have been well founded in the light of the recent outbreak of fighting between the neutralists and the Communist Pathet Lao in the Plaine des Jarres. At the conclusion of my remarks, I will insert into the Record the letter I sent to Secretary of State Dean Rusk last July. I will also include the reply sent to me by then Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Averell Harriman, at the direction of Secretary Rusk, as well as my reply to him.

Mr. Speaker, I do not rise today to claim credit for accurately predicting what would transpire in Laos; I do not claim any prescience or foreknowledge denied to my colleagues or to the executive branch. But I do claim that in the case of Laos, the administration was given ample warning by many of the Representatives of the people on both sides of the aisle concerning what would happen if we entered into that troika arrangement.

Time after time, in the situation in Laos, in South Vietnam, in Cuba, in Berlin, in the Middle East, in Africa, in almost every crisis spot we have faced, the Executive was warned by Democrats and by Republicans in the Congress of the consequences we would face if our policy were not altered.

And time after time, the executive branch has seen fit to ignore completely the advice and counsel that was offered on a truly bipartisan basis by the representatives of the people.

From this deliberate decision to ignore the counsels of Congress, we have a sorry record of rollback defeats, sorry frustrations, decline of prestige, and diminishment of freedom. This failure of bipartisanship is evident on two levels. When the Executive chooses to ignore the counsel of Congress as a whole, he thwarts what we might loosely call a bipartisanship between those two major branches of the Government. Having destroyed bipartisanship on that level, it is small wonder that bipartisanship also breaks down within the legislative branch itself.

Mr. Speaker, far worse than any news management we have witnessed thus far is this commitment on the part of the executive branch to engage in destiny management. By arrogating to itself the sole prerogative of determining what our actions should be, the executive branch is usurping what should be the responsibility of all Americans whether they live on Pennsylvania Avenue or Main Street. This destiny management bypasses the traditional role of the Congress and the people who in the past participated meaningfully in the formulation of consensus that goes far beyond the formalities of foreign policy declarations.

In every single instance one could cite in which the United States faced a cold-war crisis, there have been legislative voices raised urging a correct policy. These voices were heard but not heeded by the Executive. Instead, the Executive has chosen to ignore those voices

in order to pursue a policy that at best has been questionable.

Need I recall, for example, the legislative voices that demanded dismantlement of the Berlin wall as it was being raised? We know now that the Russians were expecting this and no nuclear holocaust would have been unleashed.

Need I recall the voice of Senator KEATING, who demanded action in Cuba long before the Executive would even admit that missiles were being placed on that island? Hindsight demonstrates that KEATING was correct, the Executive wrong.

Need I list the long roster of legislators, Democrat and Republican, who urged the establishment of a blockade or quarantine on Cuba long before Russian missiles zeroed in on the majority of our cities?

Is it necessary to recall the constant questioning of our incomprehensible policy in the Congo both by Democrats and Republicans?

Is it possible that we have not as yet learned the lesson of our own past mistakes? With such a long list of accurate predictions by the representatives of the people, is it not time to reestablish real bipartisanship? With such a long list of frustrations and failures whenever the executive unilaterally decided to ignore the right solution by pursuing the questionable one such as in Laos, is it not time for the executive to heed the counsel and advice of the representatives of the people?

Is it conceivable that only a calamity of the proportion visualized by a loss of all southeast Asia will be the only way to reestablish true bipartisanship?

Mr. Speaker, I call for the executive branch of this Government to put real meaning back into bipartisanship by listening to those men on both sides of the legislative aisle who have accurately forecast the failure of this present unilateral policy in which a built-in capacity for error is apparent. With my colleagues, I stand ready to join in a truly bipartisan effort to formulate and execute effective cold war policies.

The letters referred to above follow:

JULY 24, 1962.

HON. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is, of course, no secret that grave doubts and deep concern are being expressed in many quarters over the present Lao situation. I, too, as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, am deeply troubled. I have been for many, many months.

On the basis of information recently made public concerning the Declaration and Protocol on Neutrality in Laos, the only possible conclusion one could draw is that Laos is being surrendered to the Communists, as Poland was at Yalta 17 years ago.

The oft-expressed fear, now apparently a fact that Communist forces are being replaced in Laos to carry on the fight in South Vietnam in which 8,000 American troops are now deeply involved should be sufficient to shake administration complacency. Obviously it is not.

I strongly believe that the net effect of this agreement on Laos will be the intensification of war in southeast Asia and a weakening

of the confidence of free Asians in the value of close cooperation with the United States.

The provisions of article 14 of the declaration and protocol appear to confer a veto power on Communist Poland over the policies of the United States and all other signatory powers in relation to Laos. This, I regard as a nullification of the promises of the agreement.

I gravely disapprove of the procedure, presently being followed, which fails to submit the declaration and protocol to the U.S. Senate for ratification as a treaty.

The Congress and the country deserves a full and frank report from you on future American policy toward Laos. You will recall that President Kennedy, on March 23, 1961, told the American people, "If the Communists were to move in and dominate this country, it would endanger the security of all, and the peace of all southeast Asia, that quite obviously affects the security of the United States."

I would be interested in receiving from you a plausible explanation of what makes today any different from March 23, 1961.

Other specific questions to which I would respectfully request detailed replies would include the following:

1. On what tangible facts do you base the expectation, expressed in the declaration and protocol, that this agreement will "assist peaceful democratic development of the Kingdom of Laos" and "the strengthening of peace and security in southeast Asia"?

2. What provisions, contained in the declaration, prevent complete domination of Laos by the Communists?

3. Does the treaty specifically prohibit Communist troops presently in Laos from moving into South Vietnam?

4. How would the United States regard a veto by Poland? Would it be looked upon as a barrier to action by the non-Communist signatories of the declaration? Would it be a barrier to action in the event of a Communist takeover in Laos? Would it prevent action if the practice of dispatching Communist troops through Laos to Vietnam were continued?

5. What action would the Government of the United States take in the event of a violation of the treaty and in the face of a Polish veto on action?

It is my profound hope that you will draft an early reply to this letter, a reply that I and the American people can only hope will allay our fears about the present direction of administration policy in southeast Asia.

Sincerely yours,

AUGUST 10, 1962.

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of July 24 which raises a number of important questions about the recently concluded Geneva agreements. I am glad to have this additional opportunity to clarify our policy toward Laos and to answer your specific questions on the Geneva agreements.

We have considered, in close consultation with the congressional leadership of both parties, the various possible approaches to a settlement of the Laos question. Certainly the course of action that has been adopted is not without risk, but we believe that our present policy is the one most likely to further the national interest of the United States. That policy is to assure the maintenance of a peaceful, independent, and neutral Laos within the framework of the 1962 Geneva agreements.

I am enclosing a copy of the full texts of the agreements which were signed at Geneva. I think you will see upon a careful reading of them that, far from surrendering Laos to

6034

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

April 11

TABLE 2.—Total U.N. aid to or programed for Red bloc, 1963-64 (includes Special Fund, ETAP, other funds)

Nation	Projects	Cost
Cuba.....	16	\$2,336,080
Poland.....	30	2,007,200
Yugoslavia.....	32	4,695,643
Albania.....	3	70,000
Interregional with Red Nations Involved.....	12	583,000
Total.....	103	9,701,373

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the coming days of debate and lawmaking in the foreign aid field, we in this Congress will be successful in closing all loopholes and in providing specifically that no American contribution to any U.N. fund ever shall exceed that 33 1/3 percent now in our laws.

I have proposed a step in the right direction; the direction of fiscal sanity; the direction of realism. It is a realistic step that has widespread support and that can be accomplished quickly. It follows the recommendations of General Clay's committee for decreased, selective aid to international organizations. It could save us \$50 million.

The step I propose provides for a limit on U.S. contributions to any and all U.N. funds and budgets and will encourage other nations to assume their moral obligation to pay their fairer share of U.N. financing. Many of these nations have been rehabilitated by our unilateral aid and by U.N. aid financed chiefly by Americans.

My colleagues, let us legislate a positive 33 1/3 percent ceiling on U.S. aid to the U.N.

Let us enact a "fair share" ceiling.

A "fair share" ceiling will help make the United Nations stronger and more financially sound while at the same time making the United States of America stronger and more financially sound.

That is a good bargain.

Let us take advantage of it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend from Missouri for the wealth of information he has brought to the attention of the House in connection with the United Nations and its subsidiary organizations. I would ask the gentleman this question, Will your bill put a stop to the vicious practice of so-called voluntary contributions that have run into many, many millions of dollars?

Mr. HALL. No; I would have to say to the gentleman from Iowa who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of this House, that it would not within itself put a stop to the setting up by the United Nations or by their vote in the General Assembly of the voluntary fund, but it would keep us from participating more than the legal limit as established by the law of this Congress, which is 33 1/3 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I was speaking of the voluntary contributions made by the United States, not by the United

Nations; the voluntary contributions made by the United States to the United Nations and certain of its subsidiary organizations.

Mr. HALL. It is my opinion that it would stop those voluntary contributions over and above the regular assessments and as to those we could participate only up to 33 1/3 percent. I am sorry I missed the gentleman's point in the beginning, but he is exactly right; that is the intent of this amendment to the bill which will take us back to the original concept of this House.

Mr. GROSS. It has been through this voluntary contribution gimmick that the executive branch of our Government has been evading what Congress said was a fair share contribution, 33 1/3 percent.

Mr. HALL. It is 33 1/3 percent at the present time, but we are assessed by the U.N. only 32.02 percent as a result of the action of the Finance Administration Committee in that organization's assessment upon us.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I thoroughly agree with him; I am sick and tired of a little group of people, mostly foreigners, going to New Delhi, India, or some other faraway place, holding a meeting and fixing the share of the contribution of the United States to the United Nations or one of its many agencies. These people are actually imposing taxes upon Americans by so doing.

Mr. HALL. That is correct. I will say as I did in the body of my speech that we have exercised considerable authority and participation in the Financial Administrative Committee, as I believe it is called. We have progressively reduced our legal limit of support, with U.N. approval, and I say that not facetiously but in quotes, "approval," from 50 percent at the beginning to 32.02 percent at the present time. I would hope it would go much lower in the future, and that any future assessments by the U.N. would be progressively lessened to our true, fair share.

I want to make it obvious that I am not in this bill trying to hogtie the United Nations. I am trying to make it legal, and for us to have even stiffer legal limitations. I think this will strengthen the United Nations. It will make more nations meet their obligations. It is supported not only by me but by others, including the State Department and the President's Committee on Foreign Expenditures. Many people feel that showdown time is here. This bill is one solution. I think it is reasonable support.

CUBA, TITO, AND THE TROJAN HORSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Tito, the Communist dictator of Yugoslavia, has been very much in the news in recent days and none of that news augers well for freedom's cause.

Titoism in Yugoslavia is one of the major issues to come before this Con-

gress for resolution. It is an issue because of efforts being made to regain a favored nation status for Yugoslavia through an amendment to the foreign aid bill. The last Congress wisely removed Yugoslavia from the list of favored nations and the wisdom of that action has been amply confirmed by events in recent months.

There persists, however, remnants of the myth about Tito and the Communist regime in Yugoslavia—that Tito communism is somehow different from imperial Russian communism and that Titoism is a neutralist movement if not a movement friendly to the United States and the cause of the free world. That myth persists because of skillful manipulation of the news and a general failure to examine and understand the hard facts about Tito, Titoism, and the role of the Trojan horse in the global plans of imperial Russia.

Here are some of the hard facts which bear upon the issue before Congress on whether Tito's Yugoslavia should or should not be accorded favored nation status.

Tito is expected to pay a visit to Russian-occupied Cuba sometime in the immediate future. This visit may occur as early as June, but certainly within the next 6 months. There is some evidence, beyond the rumor stage, that Tito hopes to visit other countries in Latin America while he is in the Western Hemisphere. Within the past 10 days, President Adolfo Lopez Mateos, of Mexico, paid a so-called state visit on Tito during which he invited Tito to visit Mexico. Tito naturally accepted with enthusiasm. Such a visit to Mexico would make it that much easier for Tito to visit his comrade Castro in Russian-occupied Cuba, considering the problems of travel to Cuba these days and that the only regular airline service to Cuba is from Mexico City. Of course Tito could use a Russian jet for the trip, but that would uncover much of his Trojan Horse role in the schemes of imperial Russia. Moreover, the invitation from Mexican President Mateos provides additional "diplomatic cover" for Tito in his efforts to penetrate further the Russian cause into other Latin American Republics. The action taken by President Mateos makes him the first among the Organization of American States heads of state to break the ice for Tito in this hemisphere. The burden of resistance on other Organization of American States heads of state is thus considerably weakened and others may go the way of President Mateos.

It is generally agreed that Castro has been well exposed as a Russian Trojan Horse in the Western Hemisphere. President Kennedy played a vital role in bringing about that exposure. The Western Hemispheric crisis of last fall, when the Russians were caught red-handed in their military buildup in Cuba, provided our President with a unique opportunity to turn the floodlights of reality on the Castro regime. The impact of President Kennedy's exposure operation had a profound effect throughout all of Latin America. As a consequence, Castro is no longer useful

technical assistance program to 100 percent for two of the three special projects of the World Health Organization.

The 18 U.N. funds and budgets to which the United States is now contributing less than 33 1/2 percent include: General U.N. budget, International Maritime Consultative Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO joint support program, International Labor Organization, International Telecommunications Union, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Universal Postal Union, World Health Organization general budget, World Meteorological Organization, and the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees.

The proposed cutting back of our support to the U.N. is an effort to keep our own financial house in order, and to encourage added backing of the U.N. by other nations. This cutback is not supported only by myself and the Clay Committee. It has, indeed, received vocal support and active implementation by the Department of State.

The State Department announced March 13 that the United States no longer will support U.N. operations in the Middle East and in the Congo at rates in excess of our 32.02-percent general-budget assessment. In explaining that stand, our delegation to the United Nations under Delegate Francis Plimpton pointed directly to the 33 1/2-percent limitation in U.S. law.

My bill, presented here today, is to clarify that law so that the State Department and the U.S. delegation to the United Nations will understand that Congress wants that 33 1/2 percent ceiling applied all the time and across the board—not just when the State Department decides it is convenient to apply the law.

I note also that the State Department itself has evidenced a similar opinion. On March 12, 1963, just 1 month ago, Mr. Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, said in a speech before the American Association of the United Nations:

It is true that the regular budget scale involves a ceiling for U.S. contribution. This ceiling derives from a fundamental principle long accepted by the General Assembly—that, in an organization of sovereign states where each nation has one vote, it is not in the interest of the organization to depend too much financially on any one state The financial load simply must be more broadly based, and the carefully worked out cost-sharing formula to accomplish this is the regular budget scale.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is based on just the cost-sharing formula Mr. Gardner described. It would establish the U.S. limit at a point just above the 32.02 percent now determined for us in the United Nations budget formula, allowing a margin for minor fluctuations in our fair-share rate. Such action by us would encourage other nations to pay their fair share—whether out of dedication or dis-

gust—unless they are willing to accept a cutback of United Nations activity especially in the foreign aid field.

Let us remember that the difficulties of the U.N. do not arise from its ordinary operations. It is the extra operations that have turned the U.N. into a bottomless financial drain for American taxpayers.

Over the last few years almost 90 percent of the U.N. membership has been granted relief from making payments at their regular assessment level to the special U.N. operations of emergency forces and of foreign aid. As a consequence, the United States has been called upon to support those programs via large "voluntary" contributions.

To do that we had to wink at our limitation law.

Mr. Speaker, this situation has two unacceptable aspects:

First. It has placed a disproportionate share—nearly half—of the cost of these operations on the United States.

Second. Under this arrangement a large number of U.N. members are not meeting their obligations.

The Communist bloc pays nothing or makes only token contributions. In the case of some specific funds, France, South Africa and the Arab countries refuse to pay their fair share. Other underdeveloped nations do not pay their share, arguing that they are too poor.

Beside that, the Communist bloc limits the convertibility of currency it gives to the U.N. so that such currency often can be spent only for Communist goods and experts and only in Communist nations.

There have been several attempts to straighten out the finances of the U.N. The most notable attempt involved that \$100 million bond issue in which the United States hesitatingly agreed to participate last year.

In addition the International Court of Justice handed down last July an opinion that costs incurred by the U.N. in the Congo and Middle East operations are "expenses of the Organization" and that assessments levied to pay for them constitute binding legal obligations.

Please note that my bill does not propose that the United States refuse to meet such legal obligations. The 33 1/2 percent is, in fact, a little higher than our current legal U.N. assessment figure of 32.02 percent.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the United Nations is not being supported in many of its funds and budgets. These arrearages will continue to grow so long as both major and minor powers refuse to fulfill their legal obligations. And, so long as the American taxpayers pay the bill, there is no reason to expect that other nations will be bothered with paying them.

The United States contributes to at least 28 United Nations funds and budgets. That makes for a lot of different U.S. relationships with a lot of different international organizations each in a varied and complex field.

Thus, we find ourselves approaching something of a showdown this year. We have had some 18 years of experience now in building international organizations under the United Nations. It has been an enterprise in which the U.S. executive branch and the Congress have been partners in a great many decisions to establish or help finance international organizations.

We have arrived now at the point where it is a major responsibility of the United States to manage this complex web of relationships. But at the present point the management problems involved are almost staggeringly complex.

The U.S. Congress and our delegation to the U.N. are having to function to a significant degree as the legislature of an international organization that lacks an effective internal legislature. We have a very big voice in the U.N. budget process. We have the problem of examining U.N. programs, trying to make sure they are sensible, and meantime keeping our percentage of financial commitment down to a fair-share level.

Mr. Speaker, the financing of the United Nations has just gotten out of hand. The U.N. cannot manage it. Now it becomes apparent that the United States—saddled with its own debt—cannot finance the U.N., too.

I do not reach this conclusion lightly. I have studied U.N. finances closely and have detailed a number of questionable U.N. projects in 15 previous speeches in this House.

What is happening now, Mr. Speaker, is that the American taxpayer—who has a massive foreign aid program of his own—is being drawn unknowingly into a second foreign aid program which he finances but over which he has no effective control.

Our United States is facing the first \$12 billion planned budget deficit in all its history. We simply cannot afford to support two foreign aid programs.

We already have substantial agreement in principle to the cutting of our unilateral aid program. It is equally obvious that we must apply the cutting principle also to our donations to the United Nations. My bill proposes a realistic method of doing that. It does not end our membership in the U.N. It does make our membership a fair-share affair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since the question is always near at hand in these cold war days, I want to deal briefly with the amount of U.N. foreign aid that has gone to or is programmed for Communist bloc nations in 1963-64.

Many of these projects I have discussed here in detail in previous days. The aid includes that from the Special Fund and the expanded technical assistance program and from other U.N. funds and budgets—none of them limited to a 33 1/2-percent U.S. contribution.

My research indicates that there are now in operation—or planned—103 U.N. aid projects in the Communist bloc. These will cost the U.N. \$9,791,373 as detailed in the accompanying table.

to imperial Russia as a symbol of their wave of the future in this hemisphere. Castro is no longer the revolutionary symbol for the downtrodden and neglected masses to the south of our borders. He is now nothing more than an exposed Russian agent, a tool of an alien and despotic system.

The Russians are fully aware of what has happened to the Castro regime in terms of its appeal throughout Latin America. They have lost a long-term and expensive investment in that particular Trojan horse. But the Russians have many Trojan horses and Tito has been their most dependable one. He has weathered many storms—not the least of which was his sponsorship of a conference of so-called neutral nations arranged to coincide with the opening of the last series of Russian nuclear weapon tests. Tito and the neutralist conference provided propaganda cover to justify the Russians breaking the oral test ban understanding entered into during the Eisenhower administration. In the general political confusion which followed, Tito escaped detection of the crucial role he played in that maneuver. After we poured over \$2 billion worth of American aid into Yugoslavia, Tito rewarded us with the public promise that he would stand shoulder to shoulder with the Russians in any showdown with the free world. But Tito is, as I have said, a rather special Trojan horse of the Russians and our Government has simply refused to take him at his word.

Now Tito has been assigned the mission to take up the slack in the Russian plans for this hemisphere caused by the exposure of Castro.

Let us not forget that Tito is the symbol of that nebulous system called national communism. He has been built up as the leader of a different kind of communism, a peaceful kind, a non-violent kind, yes, even a kind of "democratic communism." All of this is, of course, a Russian-manufactured myth which some intellectuals and many theorists in the United States swallowed hook, line, and sinker. But the record shows that national communism is a propaganda technique to open the way for Russian takeover of legitimate revolutionary movements in countries where revolutionary change is the order of the day. This technique applies in countries seeking their national independence by escape from colonial rule and as well in countries where existing social and economic conditions invite revolutionary action to secure justice for the masses.

Much of Latin America is today in revolutionary ferment. There the revolution has both social and economic objectives. Revolutionary change, whether peaceful or violent, opens the door for Russian agents to enter the fray with their various techniques and methods calculated to capture leadership of the revolution. Once they have captured leadership of the revolution they immediately begin to apply their counter-revolutionary methods which we have come to call communism. Castro stands as a classic of that technique.

It is against this background that the mission of Tito to Cuba and Mexico takes

on realistic meaning. Tito hopes, as I have said, to be invited to other Republics in the hemisphere, after his visit with Castro.

These questions are pertinent to the upcoming Tito mission to Castro.

Will Tito advise Castro on the techniques of national communism and school him on the art of pilfering the pockets of the American taxpayers by promising to be a "good Communist?" Tito is proficient in both these games.

What methods will Tito use in his efforts to assume the role of Trojan horse for Moscow in the Western Hemisphere? Will he praise Castro as a reform leader who is misunderstood or will he urge the Yugoslav experiment in fraud as the answer to Castro's problems?

What is the role of Mexican President Mateos in the plans for the Tito mission? The free press reports that Lopez Mateos was in Berlin a few days ago and refused to leave his car to inspect the Berlin wall, for fear it would involve him in the East-West conflict. Does this mean that we will soon see a wave of neutralism infecting the Western Hemisphere? Neutralism follows a period of uncertainty about U.S. intentions and will in the conduct of the East-West conflict. Moreover, neutralism paves the way for the special mission of Trojan horse Tito. Tito can prove that it is highly profitable to pose as a neutral and at the same time be a shoulder-to-shoulder ally of the Russians. Fifteen years' experience at that game has made him a qualified and recognized expert.

Will the Tito visit to Cuba and Mexico create a situation in which it would be embarrassing for the United States not to invite him to make a stopover in Washington? In this age of confusion it is not at all difficult to engineer situations which on the surface can be built up as embarrassing. Not so long ago astute political leaders called this the art of fait accompli.

How many other Republics in this hemisphere have heard the Tito knock on their doors and what will be their response if the United States in any way becomes a party to this Moscow scheme?

These questions deserve honest answers. Time will provide the answers and they will be unpleasant ones if Tito and his friends are given a clear field of operations. Answers should be forthcoming now from the Department of State whose duty it is to be on top of these insidious developments. If the answers are not now known in the Department of State, a search for them would serve to raise the alert signals throughout the hemisphere.

Only yesterday the delegates of the Communist Party in Yugoslavia adopted a new constitution. It is as unique a fraud as Tito. That constitution, prepared by the Communist Party, does not reflect the will of the people in the Yugoslav empire. It certainly does not reflect the feelings of the people in the Croatian nation, the Slovenian nation, or the Serbian nation, which are held by force within that empire. It does, however, reflect the wishes of the Communist Party and the big bosses in Moscow.

The most significant revelation about the new Yugoslav Communist constitu-

tion is a change in name for the state apparatus. The new name is "Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia." It will be recalled that the former name was "Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia." This change brings the regime in Yugoslavia into closer alignment with the Moscow pattern. All the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union are known as "Socialist Republics." That name was pinned on such formerly independent nations as Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan, before they were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union. The change in name from "Peoples" to "Socialist" Republic just paves the way for the incorporation of Yugoslavia into the Soviet Union. This very likely will be accomplished by Russian legal methods—the same ones they used to bring about the illegal annexations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in 1939 or 1940.

It should be noted that only Czechoslovakia among the nations occupied by imperial Russia following World War II has changed from a "Peoples" to a "Socialist" Republic. As is known, that forced federation of once-independent nations is for all practical purposes a Soviet Republic. The Czechoslovak Communists have been rigidly loyal to mother Russia, supplying arms to Communist guerrillas in the free world, always voting the Russian line in the United Nations and more lately acting for the Communist regime in Cuba in dealings with the United States. The only difference between the Czechoslovak Communists and the Tito Communists is that the Czechoslovaks operate openly for mother Russia and the Tитоites operate covertly for mother Russia.

Tito is now 71 years of age. His time in the service of Moscow is obviously limited by the norms of life expectancy. Some informed observers hold that the new Communist constitution just adopted is insurance against a change of Communist control after Tito goes the way of all mortal men. He is made President of Yugoslavia for life under the new constitution, but the way is now cleared to incorporate Yugoslavia into the Soviet Union when Tito passes out of Russian service, should any serious problems arise in transferring Russian control to Tito's successor from among the Communist elite.

In any case, if there has been any doubt in official circles about where Tito stands on the East-West conflict, that doubt should be removed by the adoption of a Moscow dictated constitution by the delegates of the Communist movement in Yugoslavia. It is time the old Trojan horse of Moscow was unmasked. Otherwise Tito will carry on the propaganda work of Moscow in the Western Hemisphere which was exposed last fall.

THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY'S STAKE IN THE WHEAT REFERENDUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, the wheat farmers of America will be

called upon to vote on the proposition of whether to accept the programs for wheat, as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture predicated upon a bill passed by the 87th Congress, or to reject it.

This referendum will provide no choice as between one program and others—no choice as to the degree of benefits—no choice as to the lesser of two or more evils—just a simple yes or no. A “yes” vote by the wheat farmers will say we accept the program—its mixed-up price system and marketing controls, its lack of minimum acreage, its complete authority in the hands of the Secretary, the strictest control and regimentation of private enterprise ever seriously proposed in the United States, which would virtually convert farms into State enterprises. A “no” vote will say—we think the Congress will do better—that we still value our freedom, that we believe in the system that made us the greatest country in the world, the free market system.

But that is not all there is to this coming referendum. Wheat farmers are not the only producers involved; but their vote on this proposal of the Secretary will affect the livestock producers of the Nation; the dairymen, poultry, and egg producers, and the entire farming industry. In the first place, it should be recalled that most of the commodities produced by our farmers and ranchers, both numerically and dollarwise, are not under any Government program, and, generally speaking, they are not in serious trouble. True, the markets of these commodities have fluctuated. They will continue to do so if they remain free—but the farmer is a businessman—he watches the markets and adjusts accordingly.

On the other hand, there are those who feel that since a few commodities are under Government programs, they should all be there. Apparently, they would even go further than that. They would go to any length to bring all commodities under the control of a central government. Having failed several times to bring various producers to “heel”—to have enacted programs to “help” these commodities—they would now adopt the indirect approach. They mean to win, one way or another.

So let us look at some of the questions posed above.

What is all the fuss about? Simply stated, this wheat referendum involves the most severe controls ever proposed

for any segment of American agriculture. It is an authoritarian approach to a perplexing problem. Farmers are bewildered by the attitude of the Secretary—Why should he take a personal interest in promoting any program? Traditionally, this office has played referee, umpire, and arbiter. Today, it is the leading participant. Historically, the Department has dispensed fair, dependable, and reliable information. Today the facts and figures are tinged with slants and slopes toward the Secretary's program. So farmers are confused, befuddled, and bewildered—and so are a lot of other folks.

Is this all there is to the coming referendum? Well, hardly. This may be the first step but surely not the last. If this program is approved, the discretion will be in the hands of the Secretary—so some of the ideas of controls and controllers will be accomplished fact. The rest will be easy.

Are wheat farmers the only producers involved in this referendum? Again, hardly. The feed values of wheat are directly related to the feed value of corn and other grains—and these feed values are all directly related to livestock and livestock products. So all farmers are involved—but especially those who feed the dairy cows, the range and feeder cattle, the pigs, the chickens, the turkeys, and those who produce and nurture those products to fill the markets and the tables of the public. So even the consumer is concerned.

It is a melancholy fact that the nations of the world whose people are nearest to starvation and most unable to feed themselves, are the ones whose agriculture is run by a central government—an agricultural commissioner—or a dictator.

Finally, what is the stake of the livestock producers in the wheat vote? At least twofold. For many years, producers of livestock have registered the various efforts of well-meaning people to help the livestock industry. The resistance has stood them in good stead. They have done well. It is true that prices move up and down—but overall the industry is healthy. The turkey producers recently voted down a similar program, but it was not so severe as this. Attempts have been made to control hogs, cattle, and so forth.

But failing the direct approach, the Secretary, seemingly, has chosen the indirect route—control the wheat, the

feed grains, the market. Break the livestock prices, bring the producers to their knees, and they too will become easy prey for any program, for complete control in return for a handout from Uncle Sam.

The livestock people have a very real stake in this referendum. They need to help, even though they cannot vote, to defeat this vicious octopus—this insatiable desire for power, this sharp-fanged wolf in sheep's clothing before they get taken in.

Consumers also need to have a second look—before this referendum leaves them and their food supply in the hands of a patronizing government—before it follows the pattern of many other nations and leaves their stomachs empty and their children crying for milk and succor.

No nation is today better fed—at less cost, than we.

Why trade off a system which has been and is working, the system of free competitive enterprise, for one which has failed in every attempt, the system of centralized control of the right to produce, of supply management?

If you think about it a moment, you would not trade. So this referendum should be soundly defeated.

STATUS OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS IN RELATION TO THE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the Record a summary of the appropriation bills of the 88th Congress up to this time and data updating the President's January budget recommendations as to new authority to obligate the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members and others who may be interested, I include a summary of the action in the appropriation bills down to date in the current session and an approximation of the portions of the President's obligational authority budget yet to come before the House for consideration in future bills:

poration insured accounts up to a maximum of \$2,500 for each depositor. In July of 1933 this figure was increased to \$5,000.

The Banking Act of 1935 provided a permanent plan of insurance, replacing a plan in the Banking Act of 1933 that never came into force. The act of 1935 continued the \$5,000 coverage for each depositor, provided for an annual assessment of one-twelfth of 1 percent of deposits, and specified in more detail the supervisory responsibilities of the Corporation. These provisions were unchanged for the next 15 years, a period during which the chief legislative action affecting the Corporation was provision for retirement of the Corporation's original capital that had been provided by the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Act of 1950 made a number of revisions in deposit insurance: The insurance limit was raised to the present maximum of \$10,000 for each depositor, provision was made for an annual assessment credit to insured banks after allowance for Corporation losses and expenses, and additional measures for dealing with failing banks were authorized. A 1960 statute provided new methods for determining assessments, and increased the assessment credit to insured banks from 60 percent—under the 1950 act to 66½ percent of the assessment income remaining after deduction of Corporation losses and expenses.

A total of 13,021 banks, or 86 percent of all banks in the United States, became insured when the insurance took effect on January 1, 1934. The proportion of banks participating in Federal deposit insurance has increased each year; the 13,445 so insured on December 31, 1961, comprised 97 percent of the number, and held 98 percent of the deposits of all incorporated banks of deposit.

At the end of 1961 there were 514 banks, of varied types, outside Federal deposit insurance. Of this number, 195 were mutual savings banks, 141 were incorporated commercial banks operating under the general banking codes of various States, 81 were unincorporated banks, 52 were trust companies not regularly engaged in deposit banking, 34 were industrial banks, 13 were banks of deposit operating under various special charters, and 8 were branches of banks chartered in foreign countries which are included in the statistics of banks because they are engaged in deposit banking in the United States. The unincorporated banks, the trust companies not regularly engaged in banking and the branches in the United States of banks chartered in foreign countries are not eligible for Federal deposit insurance.

During the period 1934-61 the FDIC made disbursements to protect depositors in 445 failing banks. These banks had about 1,460,000 depositors and total deposits of \$611 million.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the existing record of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is one of which we can be proud. I believe also that this would be an appropriate time to look into the advisability of increasing the amount

of insurance coverage under the FDIC. As we have seen the figure has changed a number of times since the original act of 1933.

In light of modern depositor trends, an increase in the present maximum would be very helpful. The legislation I am introducing would amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act—relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts—with respect to the amount of insurance which may be provided increasing from \$10,000 to \$25,000 the maximum amount of insurance.

Cuba

HELP!

(Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1963, I rose before the House to draw attention to the conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment existing in the district which I represent. My statements were reported on page 3895 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. I now wish to reiterate that such deplorable conditions exist not only because of the usual reasons for unemployment but are aggravated by the unusual economic distress and unemployment caused by the impact of approximately 150,000 refugees residing in this area who have fled the tyranny and oppression of Castro's Communist Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion, as I have been since the passage of this act, that the area which I represent should be eligible under the terms, the spirit, and the intent of the Area Redevelopment Act, which was specifically adopted by the Congress to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

In an effort to alleviate a situation so corrosive and deleterious to the economic future of Dade County, on March 13, 1963, I introduced H.R. 4848 which goes one step further than the administrative action which I have been calling for, for so long. Congress has heretofore, at my request, recognized the problem of the Cuban refugees as one for national concern. This House, and I am grateful to each one of my colleagues, and this Congress have approved the authorizations and the appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare and other costs for the care of the Cuban refugees. Without this program, the whole cost would fall on local resources which are already strained to the limit. I am now, today, again calling, urging, and requesting the sympathetic and favorable consideration of my colleagues in this legislative body to continue their recognition of the impact and economic distress caused by the residence of approximately 150,000 refugees in the district which I represent, and the adjoining one, as still of national concern. I call the problem again to the attention of this House because the problem has not yet been completely resolved. Severe unemployment still exists—almost

13 percent. There is considerable economic distress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my bill would provide an additional criteria for eligibility under Public Law 87-27, the Area Redevelopment Act. This additional criteria would provide benefits to those areas wherein 50,000 or more Cuban refugees have resided for 1 of the 2 preceding calendar years. Such a fact would be certified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who administers the Cuban refugee program, to the Secretary of Commerce, who administers the area redevelopment program. Under the bill we would also retain the criteria that the Secretary of Labor must determine and certify to the Secretary of Commerce that a condition of substantial unemployment has existed for the last 9 of the preceding 12 calendar months, which is a requirement now carried in the present public works acceleration law.

The exact language of the bill is as follows:

A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to provide that certain areas within the United States having a large number of Cuban refugees shall be designated as redevelopment area

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2504) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall also designate as 'redemption areas' those areas within the United States where the Secretary of Labor determines that a condition of substantial unemployment has existed for at least nine of the preceding twelve calendar months, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies to the Secretary that the number of Cuban refugees residing in such areas has equalled 50,000 or more for one of the two preceding calendar years."

Florida's distinguished Senators, the Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND and the Honorable GEORGE A. SMATHERS, jointly introduced S. 1257 embodying the same provisions. My respected colleague, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER, representing Florida's Third Congressional District, introduced a similar bill, H.R. 5232, providing the same criteria together with needed additional authorization, which I fully support.

Mr. Speaker, since the Castro Communist Government of Cuba has enslaved the people of that unhappy country, it is authoritatively estimated that 200,000 persons have escaped the tyranny and oppression existing there and sought refuge in the United States.

The bulk of these people are in the Miami area. Despite the generous assistance of the Catholic church and others, our local citizens, individually, local governments and many voluntary agencies—it soon became obvious that the needs of these refugees could not be met solely out of local resources, no matter how willing the local citizens nor how desirable such a solution might be. I thereupon immediately urged recognition of the existence of the Cuban refugees and the problems caused thereby as being the primary responsibility of the Federal Government.

1963

annual agricultural output of the Soviet Union by over 60 percent.

At a time when the American farmer is being asked to take on quota allocations of feed grains, we should be pointing out that, though the United States and Russia have approximately the same amount of land planted to feed grains, U.S. production of these grains exceeds that of the Soviet Union by over 154 percent.

Obviously, with the whip of the dictator on his back, the Soviet farmer, with his communized agriculture, is simply not in the same league as the 2 million free commercial farmers in the United States.

Communism's failure as a way of life is most apparent in its agricultural collapse. I am in no position to deny that weather conditions undoubtedly did affect production in the Soviet Union this year—but, Mr. Secretary, I am unable to understand how our Government can take an official position which does not recognize the basic reasons for their lack of production—namely, the Communist society itself.

When Khrushchev was here in 1959 and visited some of our farms, he had to admit openly that our farm machinery, management, methods and research far surpassed those in the Soviet. How, then, can our Government take the position that the food shortage in Communist Europe was caused entirely by poor weather conditions.

I sincerely hope that you will see to it that the members of your Department will understand and appreciate the serious damage done by a release of this nature, which examines only the statistics of one element of a large subject and, therefore, is neither accurate nor helpful to the position of the free world in the cold war.

Ever sincerely,

OLIVER P. BOLTON.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, April 3, 1963.

Bad weather in 1962 cut agricultural production in U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe:

The Soviet Union and her East European satellites, plagued by bad weather, experienced another disappointing agricultural year in 1962, according to a recent report by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Winter crops for 1962 harvest were damaged by drought in the fall of 1961, and spring field work was delayed by cool, wet weather in East Germany, Poland, and the central and northwestern regions of European U.S.S.R. Crops in the Danubian countries, southern regions of European U.S.S.R. and the Soviet Union's new lands, were hit by drought last summer.

The report, by USDA's Economic Research Service, shows the poor agricultural year aggravated food shortages throughout Eastern Europe. Shortages were especially acute in East Germany where meat and milk production were reduced.

According to official Soviet statistics, extremely poor growing conditions caused a 20 percent drop in potato production from 1961. Russia also suffered a drop in cotton production because the second dry winter in a row reduced the supply of irrigation water.

Poland's overall agricultural output was about 5 percent less than in the previous year and fruits, vegetables, butter, milk, and eggs are in shorter supply this year, the report shows.

In Czechoslovakia, the shortage of livestock feed forced farmers to slaughter cattle and other livestock.

The corn crop in Yugoslavia was about 5 percent above 1961 but output of both barley and oats was about the same. Wheat production was about average, 5 percent less than in 1961.

According to the report, total grain production in Hungary fell for the third consecutive year. Cabbage, carrots, and parsley

were hit by drought, and production did not meet quotas.

Except in large urban centers, bread rationing is prevalent in most of Rumania because of a disappointing corn yield in 1962, the smallest since 1958.

Bulgaria's important export crops of tomatoes, grapes, and tobacco showed marked increases over the low 1961 levels. Low production forced rationing of onion, rice, beans, and potatoes.

Single copies of the report, "The 1963 Eastern Europe Agricultural Situation, Supplement No. 3 to the 1963 World Agricultural Situation," may be obtained from the Division of Information, Office of Management Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

AMERICA MUST NEVER FORGET THE NAZI HORRORS

(Mr. WYMAN (at the request of Mrs. St. GEORGE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include an article.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, we must never forget the horrors that Fascist nazism perpetrated on a whole race of human beings in the torture and death camps of Adolph Hitler. This awful record of man's inhumanity to man should be writ in marble so we who now live and those younger folk whose world is to come will so order our Government, so conduct our personal affairs, and so fashion our individual and collective political philosophy that such terrible totalitarianism will never rise again.

Time fades memory. Of these horrors we must never forget. The obsession of racial superiority that was Hitler's is a curse and invention of the devil incarnate. This is proved by the documents now being found portraying the absolute hell of gas chambers and crematoriums gassing and burning 8,000 to 12,000 human souls each day.

Today in 1963 the West should note well that the history of communism's blood baths has not yet been fully told. As the Kennedy administration gives us a policy of weakness, of compromise, of appeasement, of coexistence with communism even in this hemisphere—which is every bit as much evil as was nazism under Hitler—let us ponder well the story of Mr. Ascherson of the London Observer as it appears in today's American press:

FINDING OF JAR AT AUSCHWITZ UNCOVERS AN ACT OF HEROISM

(By Neal Ascherson)

LONDON.—The discovery of a small glass jar, buried under a handful of burned bone behind the crematorium sites at Auschwitz concentration camp, has revealed an act of heroism.

The jar—originally 1 of 36—contained day-to-day statistics of the numbers gassed in Auschwitz extermination centers in occupied Poland during October 1944.

The men who took these notes and buried them were one of the "Sonderkommando" teams, themselves Jews, who searched the luggage of each trainload of victims, stripping their bodies of hair and valuables, burning their corpses and burying the ashes.

After 3 months, each "Sonderkommando" was itself gassed.

In late 1944, however, the inflow of victims became so vast that the Auschwitz commanders allowed one experienced team to survive for many months.

PRECISE STATISTICS

This group buried precise statistics in tins and jars concealed in a site where human ash brought from the crematories was dumped.

Members of this group wrote out a precise plan of where they had buried the statistics.

Later, the whole team rose against the Nazis, but after killing some SS men and blowing up one crematorium, they were overpowered, tortured, and executed.

The only surviving witness to the tins' burial was a Pole named Henryk Porebski, a prisoner employed as an electrician on the crematorium power circuits. But the document describing where the containers had been buried had vanished, and nobody believed his story.

After the war Porebski returned to the camp, where he now works in the Auschwitz museum. He found that the whole area where the tins had been buried had been disturbed by the gruesome "gold rush" that followed the camp's liberation.

People from as far away as Cracow had come to sieve the ash fields and debris for money, jewelry, and gold tooth fillings and it seemed impossible that the tins would still be where they were buried.

Finally, Porebski convinced a woman who had also been a prisoner that he was telling the truth, and she persuaded the authorities to make a search.

Two years ago, a digging team began to trench the site with the methods of scientific archeology, impeded by the countless small possessions of the dead—from spoons to lipsticks—that were imbedded in the earth.

They kept a watch for patches of calcined human bones, which Porebski said had been scattered by the "Sonderkommando" as markers when they buried each tin.

JAR DISCOVERED

Last summer, after periodic lapses in the search, the glass jar was discovered. The contents have only been deciphered, but they give accurate data of the scale of executions when the death installation was working at maximum power.

Nazi records and the crematoria and gas chambers themselves were destroyed by the SS before the camp was evacuated.

So far, Polish authorities studying the papers found in the jar have not announced the figures of deaths that they record. They will have to be checked against previous estimates: those based on the number of prison trains arriving in late 1944 calculate that between 8,000 and 10,000 people were being gassed and cremated every 24 hours.

No other containers were found, although the diggers went to search the whole area. But Porebski's story has been justified, and the courage of the Jews of the "Sonderkommando"—whose notes in the jar also described what happened within the gassing block where they worked—can be properly honored.

INCREASE FROM \$10,000 TO \$25,000 COVERAGE FOR DEPOSITORS BY THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today for appropriate reference a bill to increase the amount of insurance coverage under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation from the present \$10,000 to \$25,000.

Beginning with the Banking Act of 1933, the Federal Deposit Insurance Cor-

1963

Two administrations and the Congress of the United States have generously responded to my requests to assist the people of the district which I represent in dealing with the problems, economic and otherwise, created by the Cuban refugees.

Today I must again ask my colleagues and advise the Nation that the people of Florida's Fourth District are in need of additional assistance as a result of approximately 150,000 Cuban refugees still residing in our midst. This has caused tremendous economic pressure since the refugees, very naturally, have tried to obtain and have been successful in obtaining employment. Much of this employment has been at reduced wages, tending to depress the labor market. Every refugee so employed has displaced an American normally employed so that in addition to many thousands of refugees who are unemployed, there are many thousands of Americans also unemployed.

The U.S. Department of Labor had long ago determined that there were a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens so as to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area. However, we have not been certified for assistance under Public Law 87-27, the Area Redevelopment Act specifically adopted by this body to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically distressed areas.

Mr. Speaker, since the fall of 1962 I have repeatedly requested the Department of Labor to certify that the unemployment condition in the district which I represent is sufficient to qualify the area under the Redevelopment Act. This has not yet been accomplished for a variety of reasons. Whatever the reason, the point is that we have not yet been so certified so as to be eligible for the employment and economic benefits which would be available to us under the Area Redevelopment Act.

The economic situation in Dade County is distressing. Total unemployment, both American and Cuban, is fantastically high. Citizens and refugees are in open competition for a limited number of jobs. Wages have tended to become depressed. Feelings are running high. The laboring classes, and particularly the Negro, have felt the brunt of this distress.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of the United States is one of long standing and great tradition—down through history we are known as a sure haven from persecution and the upholders of individual rights and freedom. But it is this very foreign policy, in action, which has permitted these refugees—mothers, fathers, wives, and children—to escape tyranny, fear, and death and to seek refuge and security in the United States.

I have no quarrel with this policy nor does the overwhelming majority of the people in the district which I represent. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the American citizens who are directly affected as a result of this policy, and who are the citizens of the district I represent, are entitled to consideration in ob-

taining whatever Federal assistance can be made available.

Today's problem, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is to obtain additional unemployment and economic benefits for the American citizens in Florida's Fourth District, which I represent, who are without jobs and who are otherwise economically distressed. My bill, Mr. Speaker, would seek to provide employment opportunities by making the area which I represent eligible for benefits under the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. Speaker, I, of course, do not imply that no assistance has been rendered to the citizens of the district which I represent. I strongly supported this administration's program, now known as Public Law 87-658, the Public Works Acceleration Act.

Just yesterday, I arose in support of the amendment which would restore to the supplemental appropriations bill for 1963 the full amount of the budget request to finance additional projects under the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act. My remarks on this subject appeared in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Because of the unemployment situation, the district which I represent has been certified as eligible to receive assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act. Under this act we have thus far obtained several million dollars in approved programs. Under this act, which requires local participation, the district which I represent will secure approximately 5,600 additional man-months or 980,700 man-hours of employment. As long as the unemployment and economic distress exist in the district which I represent, we shall continue to request assistance and urge favorable consideration for approved projects under this very worthy program.

However, Mr. Speaker, the economic distress and unemployment in the Miami area arises not only from the usual sources, but also because of the tremendous number of refugees who are residing therein. Whether the refugee is employed or unemployed, his presence contributes directly to the economic distress and high unemployment of American citizens. It is this factor which my bill deals with. It is because of the persistence of these unusual factors that I have sought relief under Public Law 87-27, the Area Redevelopment Act.

I have also long sought relief under this law by administrative determination under existing criteria. Since the middle of last year, I have requested and urged repeatedly that in the criteria determination for Area Redevelopment Act eligibility, all unemployed shall be considered regardless of whether they are Americans or refugees. While the Department has had this matter before it all these many months, it has not yet been resolved.

On March 13, 1963, I directed letters to the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor, and Commerce urging that immediate action be taken on this problem. I now report to you that I have received the following responses to my letters:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1963.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: This will acknowledge your letter of March 13, 1963, regarding the eligibility of Dade County for area redevelopment assistance.

It is my understanding that the Department of Labor is now engaged in making the necessary survey to determine whether unemployment in the area, including the special situation created by the influx of Cuban exiles, qualifies the area for assistance under the standards of the enabling act. Top officials from ARA and the Department of Labor have been meeting in Miami this week with local officials in order to expedite this determination, and we should have the results very soon.

I appreciate your calling this to my attention and understand your interest. You will be promptly advised of any further developments.

With cordial regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, March 22, 1963.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASCELL: This is in reply to your request that I "certify" to the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce the number of Cuban refugees residing in Dade County.

There are two figures on Cuban refugees about which we can be certain: the number of refugees registered at the Miami Center and the number relocated with our assistance.

On March 8, 1963, these figures were, respectively: 161,151 and 56,452. This leaves 104,699 refugees registered but not resettled through the assistance program.

While we are quite sure that the Department of Labor has these figures since the U.S. Employment Service is associated with us, both in Washington and Miami, in assisting Cuban refugees, we are immediately communicating them to Secretary Wirtz and to Secretary Hodges.

Our information is necessarily limited to figures on refugees who have registered with us and who have been resettled through our program. We, therefore, do not have any figures on the number of Cuban refugees who have resettled from Miami without our assistance or on the number of refugees who may be living in Miami that have not registered with us.

If we can be of further assistance we shall be pleased to do so.

Sincerely,
ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1969.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FASCELL: I have been informed that Area Redevelopment Administrator William L. Batt, Jr., met with you this past week and that you had a full discussion of the situation in Dade County. I am thankful for this exchange and I know that he reiterated my concern for the very difficult situation arising from the presence of the large number of Cuban refugees in the Miami area.

Let me assure you that we will act just as soon as the data to be provided by the Secre-

April 11

tary of Labor becomes available. I understand that the promised survey is underway and that we can expect results within weeks. We have the personal assurances of officials of the Department of Labor that they are actively pressing the investigation.

Mr. Batt also informed me of recent special legislation that you have introduced on this matter. I am certain that through our common efforts we can find a reasonable solution to the unusual situation in Miami.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to report today that hearings were conducted before the Banking and Currency Committee on April 9 in support of the proposed legislation to amend the Area Redevelopment Act.

At that time corroborating testimony to existent conditions in Dade County was given by the Honorable Robert King High, mayor of the city of Miami, Fla.; the Honorable Joseph A. Boyd, Jr., chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County, Fla.; Mr. W. J. Owens, president of the Dade County Federation of Labor; the Honorable Arthur Patten, Jr., county commissioner of Dade County; and the following Representatives to the Florida State Legislature from Dade County: the Honorable Leo Furlong, the Honorable Richard Pettigrew, the Honorable Maxine Baker, the Honorable Lee Weissenborn, and Mr. John Frederick Thomas, director of the Cuban refugee program welfare, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Also in attendance to lend his support was the Honorable Irving G. McNayr, county manager of Metropolitan Dade County.

Testifying in absentia by the submission of statements were the Honorable Charles R. Hadley, chairman of the Citizens Committee of Dade County, and Mr. John B. Turner, president of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce.

Unable to be present but represented by a telegram of support was Florida's State representative, the Honorable Mary Ann MacKenzie, from Dade County.

Showing the unanimity of support for immediate legislative action, House Memorial 229 was received from the Florida State Legislature, to wit:

HOUSE MEMORIAL 229

Memorial to the Congress of the United States to more fully recognize that the impact of approximately 150,000 Cuban refugees has created a substantial and persistent unemployment and social problem, which has and does exist in the heavily populated Dade County area and that further and immediate action must be taken and prompt remedies be found to alleviate the harmful conditions that do now exist and will continue to exist and become acute with the continuous heavy influx of these refugees among the residents of this State

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore given recognition to the existence of the large numbers of Cuban refugees in this State and to the problems caused thereby; and

Whereas this large number of refugees who continue to flee from the tyrannical and oppressive conditions of the communistic government of Cuba to seek a haven in a democratic country where human rights and dignity are recognized supreme; and

Whereas it has become obvious that the needs of these refugees who, through no fault of their own, have become a burden on certain local areas of this State and that the local resources and facilities of these areas have been taxed beyond their capacities; and

Whereas the education of Cuban refugee children is now pressing hard on the educational funds and facilities provided by the State of Florida; and

Whereas the present existence of this large number of Cuban refugees has already placed tremendous and herculean economic burdens upon the local residents and the local governments of these areas in that the local labor market has been drastically affected to the detriment of the permanent working population; and

Whereas many of these local residents are being displaced from their regular employment and thus becoming an additional economic burden to the local welfare bureau and in many instances causing the permanent residents in these areas to become a burden on their friends and relatives; and

Whereas the charitable organizations in these areas have also had placed on them an unduly heavy economic burden arising as a result of the tremendous influx of Cuban refugees which has strained their resources to the breaking point; and

Whereas it has become obvious that the needs of these refugees cannot be met from local resources and facilities which have been substantially depleted; and

Whereas regardless of previous measures to alleviate this burdensome problem, the continued increase in the numbers of refugees to be found in the Dade County area, which is the major port of entry for these helpless and unfortunate refugees, due to the existing policy of the U.S. Government, and

Whereas there is the ever-present danger that the problems created by this tremendous influx of Cuban refugees may spread to other areas of Florida and aggravate their problems; and

Whereas this tremendous problem must be immediately alleviated in order to prevent irreparable harm, both to the economic and social well-being of the citizens of this State; and

Whereas these helpless and unfortunate Cuban refugees and local residents who have been displaced from their places of employment because of these problems in these local areas, now have more than doubled in number the unemployment in these local areas and have brought the unemployment situation in these areas to a critical stage; and

Whereas there is pending legislation in the Congress of the United States with a definite purpose to alleviate the acute economic and social problems caused in these local areas by Cuban refugees fleeing the tyrannical and oppressive pressure of the communistic government of Cuba: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully urged and requested to give full recognition to the fact that the Cuban refugee problem in this State is primarily the responsibility of the Federal Government and of national concern and ask that additional assistance and relief be provided to Dade County and any other counties similarly affected and that other Cuban refugee centers be established in the United States and other ports of entry be established for the entrance of these unfortunate and helpless refugees from Communist tyranny; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Sec-

retary of Commerce of the United States; to the Secretary of Labor of the United States; to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States; and to each member of the Florida congressional delegation.

Supporting statements and/or formal resolutions supporting the request for the extension of ARA assistance to Dade County were submitted by the Honorable Farris Bryant, Governor of the State of Florida; City Council of Miami Beach; South Dade Council of Miami-Dade Chamber of Commerce; the county commissioners of Dade County, Fla.; City Council of City of North Miami Beach; Dade County League of Municipalities; North Miami Beach Chamber of Commerce; and the City Council of Miami Springs.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to reiterate my previous remarks that for many years now the people of the district which I represent have willingly, courageously, and generously borne the brunt of the problems brought about by the approximately 150,000 non-American refugees living and working with us. We have been and are proud of the part which we have been called upon to play in the longstanding humane concepts of a free society, indicating to the refugees and to the world, proof of its concern for the dignity and the worth of an individual. This principle, among others, separates us clearly from the Communists or any other system which seeks to enslave mankind, and holds individual worth and dignity as secondary or even unnecessary. But, Mr. Speaker, in doing all this, we must also take every step to see to it that our own citizens receive assistance from our Government, particularly and especially when such assistance is within the spirit and intent of laws already enacted by this body.

I wish to remind my colleagues that the situation now existing in Dade County is not the result of the actions or foreign policy of the Floridians, but rather a direct result of American tradition and policy, many times reaffirmed by every administration of the U.S. Government. The burden of responsibility and solution must not remain with the citizens of Dade County, Fla. It must be shared by all.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE ACT OF 1963

(Mr. ST GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to present this companion measure to the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963 which is designed to provide effective medical care for our senior citizens.

The provisions of this bill are too well known to necessitate a further explanation at this time. However, it is impossible to overstate the great need which exists for the prompt enactment of this legislation.

There are now approximately 17.5 million people in this country who are age 65 or over. With few exceptions,